

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 93 02:16:39 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #253  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 25 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    253

Today's Topics:

    1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs. (2 msgs)  
        ARRL opposes temporary permits (2 msgs)  
        Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer  
            Code/NoCode  
    STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 24 Jul 1993 16:48:03 -0500  
From: cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK. Enough of the recent stuff. Where are the results of the ARRL  
membership poll conducted in the March 1947 issue of QST??? Yes, 1947.

Support was being measured for the creation of a codeless licence with  
privileges above 1215 MHz (around there, anyway).

Seems folks were concerned that if we didn't begin to use our microwave  
privileges that we would eventually lose them. That, combined with the  
number of veterans coming out of the service that had new skills  
(RADAR,etc.), seems to have led to the proposal.

73,  
Peter Laws

N5UWY/AA, V31WY, VE2???

(a former "codeless" Tech who thinks we are giving away the store with the present Tech privileges)

Peter Laws | "The '90s are gonna make the '60s|plaws@uafhp.uark.edu  
n5uwy@ka5bml.ar.usa.noam| look like the '50s" --D. Hopper|plaws@uafsysb.bitnet

-----  
Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1993 00:17:10 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

plaws@uafhp.uark.edu (Peter Laws) writes:

>(a former "codeless" Tech who thinks we are giving away the store with the  
>present Tech privileges)

Well Peter, I tend to agree with you.

Despite the impression some people receive from my postings, I really am in favor on a codeless license. However, I felt that the current codeless license was implemented incorrect.

For example, people claim that the codeless tech license was designed to increase the amateur population, and swell unused bands with new blood, thus saving our bandwidth.

However, there is no incentive for people to operate on those bands. A codeless tech is, by default, going to operate on 2 meters, its the most crowded, popular band (yes, with exceptions, I'm sure).

If people were so damn concerned about preserving bandwidth, why didn't they give codeless techs access only to those bands that needed additional utilization, and save the existing, crowded UHF/VHF bands for those that decided to upgrade? After all, isn't that what incentive licensing is supposed to be for? What better way to protect bandwidth by flooding underused bands with new, codeless techs?

Furthermore, I think that codeless techs should have to pass not only elements 2 and 3a, but element 3b as well. Additionally, the tests should not be "dumbed down" any further, and instead strengthened technically so those operators who come in to the hobby (and those that upgrade from Novice, etc.,) really know the technical ins-and-outs of the hobby. No, not to the point where they need an MSEE to pass, but certainly revised question pools that accurately reflect today's technology, structured in

such a way that people cannot readily memorize the question pool only to forget it the day after they take it (how many "How do I construct a dipole" messages are we going to read in iram before someone wakes up and says 'gee, didn't these people remember anything?')

Unfortunately, in this area, most of the codeless techs I have met are true CB transplants. Its even gotten to the point where the local Ham club now has "coffee breaks" every other month. Every day listening to 2 meters yields a new chuckler: "You have a super-fine-one, ya hear?" "I'm going to stop by your 20, after I stop to get some Motion-Lotion Potion." "Want me to pick up some Mocha-Java on the way over?"

Then, I could tell you the story of the no-clue who came on simplex one evening when I was talking with a few friends and told me how I "should be talking on a repeater because someone might be able to learn something from the conversation". Obviously, he forgot about how repeaters should only be used if two stations can't communicate simplex, so we taught him.

MD

-----  
Date: 22 Jul 1993 17:55:13 -0400  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!eddie.mit.edu!news.intercon.com!panix!not-for-  
mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22mh69INNn2s@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:  
>>SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB075  
>>ARLB075 Board meeting news  
>>  
>>ZCZC AG17  
>>QST de W1AW  
>>ARRL Bulletin 75 ARLB075  
>>>From ARRL Headquarters  
>>Newington CT July 18, 1993  
>>To all radio amateurs  
>>  
>>SB QST ARL ARLB075  
>>ARLB075 Board meeting news  
>>  
>>The ARRL Board of Directors met in Windsor Locks, Connecticut, July  
>>16-17. The following is a summary of the actions taken:

>>  
>> ...  
>>  
>>The Board committed League support for the FCC efforts to implement  
>>electronic filing of license and upgrade applications. The General  
>>Counsel was directed to file comments opposing any attempt by any  
>>authority, other than FCC, to provide a point-of-examination  
>>temporary operating authority.  
>  
>Hmmm. Here they (the ARRL) go again, blind-siding us with a policy  
>position before having allowed sufficient (any?) time for open debate.  
>Now in a preemptive strike they've deployed their legal SWAT team to  
>file an opposition paper against allowing the issuance of temporary  
>callsigns by the VE's.

This, as I understand it, is following a long-established policy to ensure that Amateur Radio operators continue to have \*FCC\* licenses.

You may not have noticed it, but the FCC is trying to get out of the Amateur Radio business. Letting other than the FCC issue licenses, even temporary ones, could easily be a precedent for the FCC getting completely out of the Amateur Radio licensing business.

With FCC licenses we have some protection from state and local authorities. ("With all due respect, officer, I hold a Federal license for this equipment. If you are also an FCC Radio Inspector, or hold a valid license in the Amateur Radio Service, I will happily hand this radio to you. If not I will only do so under protest, as you will be forcing me to violate Federal Law." Far fetched? Yes, but possible.)

>  
>I'll be the first to admit that I don't know who my local section  
>manager is. I didn't vote at all in the last local section election.

Then, IMHO, you have no right whatsoever to comment on ARRL actions.

>I don't think that it's possible for anyone other than myself to  
>represent my views when it comes to voting for change. There could  
>not have possibly been a nominee who represented my views on all of  
>the issues which might arise. Why then, should I compromise by voting  
>for a candidate which possibly represented some of my views?

Do you vote in governmental elections? Are you at all familiar with how representational government works?

>It couldn't be that difficult for the ARRL to hold general elections.  
>I get mail-in ballots cards once a year from several companies for  
>which I'm a stock holder. Presumably, as a [member] I'm a 'stock  
>holder' in the ARRL too. I get numerous mailings from the League  
>each year, how much could it cost them to do a mass ballot? I suspect  
>that cost is not the issue, but rather the desire by those currently  
>in power not to dilute their considerable influence by the whims and  
>will of the unwashed masses.  
>

If you really want to change things then find others of a like mind in  
your Division, choose a candidate, and run a campaign for Director.  
Express your views to the members in your Division. If a majority agree  
with you then your candidate will win and be in a position to work towards  
the changes you desire.

However, this requires you to become active and involved.

If you choose to do this, great! The ARRL, like all organizations, will  
be better off with more debate and ideas. Participation is what makes the  
difference.

It's really a case of "put up or shut up." If you become involved you  
will be listened to. If not, well....

73, Andy, KB7UV

--

```
----- Andrew Funk, KB7UV -----  
|      Chair, Radio Amateur Telecommunications Society (RATS)      |  
| ENG Editor/Microwave Control, WCBS-TV Channel 2 News, New York |  
| Internet: kb7uv@panix.com      Packet: kb7uv@kb7uv.#nli.ny.usa |
```

-----  
Date: 23 Jul 93 15:09:37 GMT  
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd  
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

<Comments about ARRL position on temporary permits>

It was refreshing to see an opinion presented in an organized and  
well-reasoned manner. I don't completely agree with what he said,

but then I don't completely disagree, either. :-)

However:

>Why doesn't the ARRL take opinion polls? The very idea that we elect  
>representative members to voice our opinions in anachronistic at best.  
>Has the ARRL ever held a general vote of the membership? Why can't  
>the ARRL poll its membership? Why does it continue to hold on to  
>the decidedly disrepresentative method of governing?

Although we have been known to do the occasional scientific poll, the majority of the Directors operate a bit less formally. I don't think this is necessarily bad. This means that the feedback received by the Directors are from those who care enough about the issues to speak out. In many cases, the burning issues of Amateur Radio don't have time available to formulate a true scientific sample, get it mailed out and wait for a 5% return rate. Later in your post you suggest that voter turnout in the elections is dismal; what would make you think that a poll would have a higher turnout? (Try an email poll and see what percentage of the 45,000 r.r.a.m. readers respond!)

The Directors are accessible and available, and, for the most part they do honestly evaluate input before making their policy decisions. I (and others) have said it often; make your views known to your Division Director. Why would a mailed poll be a better alternative than having the ARRL policy makers available in person, by mail, by telephone or by email. You can, if you wish, even confront your Director in front of a group at an ARRL Forum.

There may be times when the Board jumps the gun a bit, and decides an issue without sufficient input. If and when this happens, it is a problem that needs to be corrected, and usually is. However, the best solution to this is not membership polling. It is open and energetic communication. The door is wide open; all are invited to step through it.

As far as hams not voting, if only a few hams choose to participate, we can't force them. If people choose to have their decisions made by others, I can only offer that they may have to live with consequences they don't like. There may be cases where one chooses not to vote, but, for the most part, I suspect that those who don't vote will not respond to surveys, either. So, no matter how we do it, you could still claim that the issues are being decided by a small percentage. And, in either case you would be right; the issues are being decided by those who take positive steps to make that decision happen.

>Why then, should I compromise by voting for a candidate which possibly  
>represented some of my views?

Is this not better than not voting for a candidate and possibly getting someone who represents NONE of your views? If all other things were to be equal, I usually vote for intelligence and open-mindedness. I rarely see those distributed equally between any two people. (Open-mindedness has a slight edge, IMHO.)

>I suspect that cost is not the issue, but rather the desire by those  
>currently in power not to dilute their considerable influence by the whims  
>and will of the unwashed masses.

I can never understand how and why people will assume motivations without any possible reason, and then offer those assumptions as fact. Other than "I can't think of anything else it could be, so ...", on what occurrence was this opinion based?

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

-----  
Ed Hare, KA1CV  
American Radio Relay League  
225 Main St.  
Newington, CT 06111  
(203) 666-1541 - voice  
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor  
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing  
-----  
ehare@arrl.org  
"You will never put the puzzle together  
if you keep putting all of the pieces  
back in the box." Colleen

-----  
Date: 21 Jul 93 12:05:50 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!dragon!nj8j!ben@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dstock@hpbqmoqa.sqf.hp.com (David Stockton) writes:

> What will the FCC do when their old mainframe finally dies ?

My understanding is that when the FCC finally retires that ol' klunker, the Smithsonian wants it! Probably for their antique-computer collection. :-)

Ben

+-----+-----+  
| Ben Coleman NJ8J | "All that is not eternal is |  
| AX.25: NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA | eternally irrelevant." |

| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us | C. S. Lewis |  
+-----+

-----  
Date: 23 Jul 93 20:49:36 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Code/NoCode  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CAKJp8.6CK@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu (Swami Kumaresan)  
writes:

>  
>Maybe the FCC should allow a nocode license for one year,  
>after that the code must be taken...I don't know, just a thought...  
>  
Could this idea be coming from the original Novice class licenses??

: -)

--  
Will Turner, N0RDV  
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |  
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |  
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

-----  
Date: 23 Jul 1993 07:02 EDT  
From: crash!newshub.nosc.mil!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!  
howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!ncar!uchinews!cs.umd.edu!  
skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!@news.cerf.net  
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1786@arrl.org>, bjahnke@arrl.org (Bart Jahnke) writes...  
>

[stuff deleted]

>And yes, each answer sheet, code copy sheet, 610, CSCE (previous and current),  
>and any other document(s) for each applicant are reviewed. Nearly each  
>license copy has to be trimmed and attached to the 610, as the FCC requires.  
>Attendance averages twelve applicants per session, with a routine number  
>of sessions including 25 to 40 applicants or more.



>  
>A file is then created for test forms. Session summary results are entered  
>into a computer. The VE Team's credentials are verified. An FCC summary  
>form is created/copied for forwarding/filing. And so on...  
>  
>Year around, we probably average four to six days processing time.  
>Sometimes more, per above, and sometimes less. As for us turning  
>an exam the same day received, we'd like to do that--but  
>we aren't able to do so at present. Of course, whenever  
>the FCC goes beyond six weeks themselves, one-third of our staff  
>find themselves answering inquiries from applicants regarding the  
>whereabouts of their license. This is often six to seven weeks into the  
>process. We would be glad to have those staff members processing  
>sessions too...  
>  
>Informationally, we have given each ARRL VE Team (and VE) an information  
>sheet--that they are to hand out to applicants--which covers the typical  
>wait for a license (specified at about ten weeks from the test date). We  
>verbally indicate eight to ten weeks to callers.  
>  
>The FCC quotes 90 days. If an inquiry is made by an applicant to  
>the FCC before 90 days have elapsed, the FCC will sometimes advise that  
>the caller check back at 90 days--or, if the license has not been issued,  
>they will review their computer records and, if nothing is found, they  
>will give their \*standard\* response, "We have no record of that application!"  
>  
>Great response, eh? Well, the FCC only records on their computer  
>the fact that an application is at their facility when it is actually  
>keyboarded.  
>  
>When is it keyboarded? The 2nd to the last step in their process--which  
>is on a Tuesday (about five to seven weeks after they have received).  
>  
>What is the last step? Two days later (the same week, on that Thursday), the  
>license is laser printed and mailed. You then receive it via first-class mail  
>within the next few days.  
>  
>73,  
>  
>Bart J. Jahnke, KB9NM  
>Manager  
>ARRL/VEC

Both the VECs and the FCC makes poor to no use of computing facilities.

1) In all cases computers could be used by the VE to enter the test  
result information in the format required by the VEC

2) Diskettees and paperwork (which really should be negotiated for elimination with the FCC for total electronic document interface (EDI))) could be sent to the VEC. VEC could then ingest into its on-line system

3) The VE should be responsible (and really are de facto if not de iure) for the validation and verification of format and content. As a result minimum checking should really be done by the VEC. If everyone has to do everything again then somehow the system has processing flaws.

4) The validation of the VEs should be handled by a number assigned to the VE as part of their certification by the VECs.

This process at all levels is still !!!! T00 !!!! manual. It appears as if the belief is that a manual process is the only way to ensure accuracy and validity. Just because we haven't automated the WHOLE process before doesn't mean we can't start doing it now. Very few of the type of people performing VE service don't have access to a computer. Paper should be involved only because of the FCC and we should really lobby to automate their part so we can use EDI when dealing with them.

Erich  
N30XM

Date: 23 Jul 1993 07:59:38 -0400  
From: news.cerf.net!crash!newshub.nosc.mil!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!  
howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!genrad.com!genrad.com!not-for-  
mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[illegible]

>and non-members alike, is subsidized by the ARRL membership.

This statement above is absolutely correct. In fact, the last time I was down at ARRL, they mentioned (in the VEC office) that the fees from the testing sessions don't even cover the expenses to copy all the forms and tests (BLANK FORMS) and to process everything (FILLED IN FORMS). That means the moneys for this are coming out of the membership's back pocket and the goodwill of the volunteers.

I suspect the story is the same with W5YI and all other VECs.

THANK YOU, ARRL AND W5YI AND ALL THE REST, FOR THE SERVICES YOU PROVIDE.

It would be nice to hear more positive items on this net instead of the constant code-nocode battles, or the incessant ARRL criticisms and blamings. I know, that WOULD be asking too much.

Diana L. Carlson  
VE, Incoming QSL card sorter, CAP member.  
What have you volunteered for recently?

"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

--  
->Diana L. (Syriac) Carlson dls@genrad.com Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea) <-  
->I'D RATHER BE FLYING! P-ASEL, INST CAP: CPT, Freedom 690 Mobile<-  
->AD ASTRA, PER ASPERA Airplane: None :-(  
<-  
->GenRad, MS/6, 300 Baker Ave, Concord, Mass. 01742 (508)369-4400 x2459 <-

-----  
Date: 23 Jul 93 08:00:49 GMT  
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Tom Bodoh (bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov) wrote:

: ARRL - what's the real scoop? Please answer here rather than email - it  
: seems that inquiring minds want to know...

I got a response by e-mail, but don't consider it appropriate to post it publicly. I hope that they will defend themselves publicly.

One area I would like detailed is EXACTLY what they must do to each application before forwarding it to the FCC.

The 610 and all the tests are filled out when they get them, as far as I can tell. There must be something that is not obvious that they do.

What is it, And why can W5YI complete the same function so much more efficiently?

I find it interesting that ALL responses to my original post, e-mail and personal, (excepting those from ARRL), have been statements supporting my view.

The Anally Retentive Regulation Lovers, (pardon my sense of humor), have an image problem, and not just with people waiting for their license but hams of long standing.

They do provide a service though, and I would not seek to dissuade anyone from joining. I read their magazine and will likely join myself. I would like to see them work on this problem.

BTW, The individual I spoke to was very helpful in providing all the information available to him and I have no malice against any person at the ARRL. If the department handling the paperwork needs help I would like to see them get it.

I believe the SYSTEM is the problem, NOT the people!

Gene

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares  
are destined to plow for those who don't.  
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

-----

Date: 24 Jul 93 00:41:12 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22mh69INNn2s@west.West.Sun.COM>,  
<1993Jul23.122412.19994@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, <22ovicINNju2@topaz.bds.com>  
Subject : Re: ARRL and it's members

ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights  
>as to the ARRL's activities.

Bullshit. If the ARRL professes itself to "represent the amateur community", then \*every\* amateur, regardless of whether or not they have paid tribute to the Newington Gods, is perfectly within his/her rights to criticize the ARRL for \*anything\* they do "representing the amateur community".

-----  
Date: 23 Jul 1993 07:51 EDT  
From: crash!newshub.nosc.mil!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!  
howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!ra!cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!  
nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@@news.cerf.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,  
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <2374@indep1.UUCP>in.sura  
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

[stuff deleted]

> If ANY "optional" mode should be used to differentiate, it should be  
>CW. Frankly, my idea of a really good Extra Class test would be to lock  
>the applicant in a room with two or three old TVs and AM radios and give  
>him three hours to get a message out from inside the room, using an  
>amateur frequency in any mode he chose. I'll bet those who did it  
>successfully (all three of them) would be using CW.

>--

>+-----+  
>| Cliff Sharp | clifto@indep1.chi.il.us OR clifto@indep1.uucp |  
>| WA9PDM | Use whichever one works |  
>+-----+

This is the biggest bunch of manure that I have run across from this group of people that think that CW will save the world, the nation and the hobby. First Cliff's comments don't represent what I suggested. I didn't say that any one of these operational modes should be THE differentiator. Rather, I said that if it is only one then who says it should be CW. The diiferentiator should be all of them. Also locking people in a room to play with a bunch of radios and TVs wouldn't prove anything either except that they can play with only TVs and radios. Neither CW nor electronics repair constitutes all of the ham hobby.

As far as Cliff's expressed opinion that the CW people would be the only successful players in his game, this is sheer nonsense. I know CW people (I guess according to Cliff this is a superior class worthy of higher\

privilege than the masses!) that are stupid and redneck beyond belief. On the other hand I know CW people who have passed on a great deal on knowledge to me. Generally, as a person I don't judge people on some class distinction. I have always believed that their merit should be the determiner. One element (e.g. CW) alone does not make a valid indicator.

Erich  
N3OXM

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #253  
\*\*\*\*\*